



AN ENQUIRY

INTO

THE POSSIBILITY OF OBTAINING MEANS

FOR

CHURCH EXTENSION

WITHOUT PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,

AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1841.

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

TO THE
ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS
FOR ENGLAND AND WALES,
THESE PAGES
ARE
RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED.

AN
E N Q U I R Y,

&c.

PUBLIC attention has lately been so much called to the subject of Church Extension, and there is so general a conviction of the necessity of adopting some measures to relieve the spiritual destitution of this country, and to obviate the dangers which are connected with it, that the friends of the Church have little more to do, than to suggest and examine specific designs for rendering the Church co-extensive with the wants of our population.

Mr. Gresley's recent pamphlet, "Remarks on the necessity of attempting a Restoration of the National Church," contains various practical suggestions on this subject, which will doubtless receive that attention they so amply deserve. In the general views put forward in that publication, I, for one, entirely concur; and it is the object of the following pages to show the feasibility of some parts of the plan, to which objections may be raised; and to supply additional suggestions and

details grounded on authoritative documents and calculations.

One of the chief merits of Mr. Gresley's plan seems to consist in its rendering ecclesiastical resources available for ecclesiastical purposes, instead of relying exclusively on the assistance of the State. That a Christian State is indeed bound by the strongest obligations of moral duty and of sound policy, to provide sufficient means for the religious instruction and guidance of the people, is a truth which may be fairly assumed as incontestible. The Church, in asking for the assistance of the State, merely reminds the latter of the duty which it owes to the nation; and a State which possesses the means of fulfilling this duty, and neglects or refuses to perform it, is most deeply responsible for the evils which may ensue.

But, if the obligations of the State in reference to the support of religion be thus solemn, those of the Church herself are not less so; and she is bound, not only by a sense of responsibility to God, but by the benefits which she receives from the State, and by her duties as a component part of the commonwealth, to lend assistance, to the utmost of her power, in furtherance of the great object for which she exists. It was on this principle that the Act in reference to Cathedral property was based; and I have always been firmly convinced, that whether that measure be considered in principle or in

detail, its authors and supporters are entitled to the warmest gratitude and approbation of every member of the Church of England.

If, however, this obligation be incumbent on the Church at all times, it becomes especially cogent when the State is involved in difficulties which present an impediment to the discharge of its duty. Present circumstances seem to call us imperatively to the practical application of this view, for desirable as it might be to obtain grants of public money from the liberality of parliament, we cannot close our eyes to the improbability of our being enabled, within any definite period, to receive effectual relief from that quarter; and, looking more especially to the sentiments expressed in parliament by leading members of various political parties, it would seem that the true policy of the Church consists in making immediately available every resource actually within her reach, without foregoing her rightful claim to further assistance from the State, whenever that assistance may be attainable and necessary.

In the equity of the general principle few of the Clergy will hesitate to concur; and if it be, in fact, possible for the Church, by economizing her own means, and by affording greater facilities for the action of private liberality, to avoid the necessity for making demands on the exhausted treasury of a heavily-burdened State, or even to diminish

in some degree the extent of her claim for assistance, there can be little doubt of the propriety of adopting a course so consistent with the dignity and independence of the Church herself, so evidently dictated by pure and patriotic motives, and so little exposed to those jealousies and that opposition, to which a different mode of proceeding might not improbably give rise.

With these views, I shall proceed, without further preface, to present an outline of the present necessities of the Church of England, and to suggest measures for their relief, under the various heads of—I. Clergy; II. Churches and Clerical Residences; III. Bishops; IV. Ecclesiastical Seminaries.

I. CLERGY.

Deficient
numbers of
Clergy.

The Abstract of the Population Returns in 1831, the Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into Ecclesiastical Revenues, the various Reports of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, together with Gilbert's Clerical Guide, and the Clergy List for 1841, supply a number of data, from which some notion may be formed of our present wants in respect of Clergy.

Basis of
Calculation.

The usual basis which has been taken in estimating the extent of religious destitution—namely,

the amount of Church accommodation, is, perhaps, not exactly that which ought to have been adopted. *The number of Clergy* would seem to be a more correct standard in general. A parish church might contain 2000 sittings, and be sufficiently large for a parish containing 6000 people ; but it might be served by only one clergyman, who would be wholly unequal to the care of so large a population. A parish, then, with sufficient church room, might be comparatively destitute of spiritual aid. On the other hand, a parish with inadequate church accommodation, may be effectually guided and influenced by a clergyman, who is enabled by the size of his cure to communicate personally with all his parishioners.

Speaking from experience, and from consultation with others, I should say, that the care of 1000 souls on an average, would be amply sufficient for the full employment of each clergyman. This, then, may be assumed as the basis of our calculations, which will be conducted under several forms.

(1.) The population of England and Wales is, in 1841, about 16,000,000, which, according to our assumed basis, would require 16,000 clergy.

Now, it appears from Gilbert's Clerical Guide, Number of Parochial Clergy. that the 10,718 benefices of England and Wales, are held by 7565 individuals. It also appears from a Return made by the Archbishops and Bishops to Her Majesty's Privy Council in 1838, that there

are 4811 curates. Adding together the number of Incumbents and Curates, we obtain 12,376 as the total number of the parochial clergy. But this exceeds the truth, because two curacies are not unfrequently held by the same person, and the Incumbent of one parish is sometimes the Curate of another. So that, on the whole, there is reason to believe, that the number of parochial clergy does not exceed 12,000, which shows a deficiency of 4000 clergy at present.

Our deficiency is, however, still greater than this; for it must be remembered, that many of our parishes contain very small populations. Judging from a rough estimate, it would seem that about 3000 parishes contain less than 300 inhabitants each, affording perhaps about 200 on an average, or a total population of not more than 600,000. Thus 3000 clergy are engaged in the care of 600,000 souls, while the remaining 9000 clergy are entrusted with the care of 15,400,000; showing a total deficiency of 6400 clergy for the care of 6,400,000 people.

This result is of such a nature, that I should have hesitated to make it public, had it not been substantially confirmed by various examinations instituted with a view to test its general correctness.

(2.) Another mode by which we may approximate to a knowledge of the deficiency now exist-

ing, is to compare the population of cities, towns, and populous districts, with the number of clergy employed in them.

It appears from a Report of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, that thirty-four parishes in London and its suburbs, with a population exceeding 10,000 each, contained, according to the census of 1831, a population of 1,137,000, with only 139 parochial clergymen. According to our basis, this alone shows a deficiency of clergy for 994,000 people. But there were by the same census, forty other parishes in London and its suburbs, with populations varying from 3000 to 10,000, making a total of 235,266, and served by only eighty-two clergymen. This shows a further deficiency of clergy, for about 153,000 souls; which, added to the former deficiency, presents a total of 1,151,000 people deprived of spiritual instruction in 1831. If we add twenty per cent. to represent the increase of the last ten years, (which would not, I believe, exceed the truth,) we have now in the above parishes of London and its suburbs a population of 1,646,400 under the spiritual care of 221 clergy, leaving in the metropolis alone, the enormous number of 1,425,000 people unprovided with spiritual aid, and requiring for their care upwards of 1400 clergy in addition to the present ecclesiastical force of the metropolis. If, in short, the clergy of London were multiplied *seven-fold* at

Destitution
of the Me-
tropolis.

this moment, they would all have full and ample occupation.

I have pursued the same mode of calculation throughout the country generally, and the result is, that in 118 of the cities, towns, and parishes, with a population exceeding 10,000, there were in 1831, about 3,308,655 souls under the care of 667 clergymen, showing 2,641,655 souls unprovided for by the Church. It also appeared, that in parishes containing between 2000 and 10,000, there were, on the whole, about 1,360,000 souls without clerical aid. Adding twenty per cent. to represent the increase in population since 1831, we obtain the following result :

DESTITUTE POPULATION, 1841.

London	1,425,400
Great Towns, &c.	3,307,000
Lesser Towns, &c.	1,632,000
Total	6,364,400

(3.) With a view to test still further the general correctness of these results, a third mode of computation was resorted to. Having under consideration the population of each parish, according to the census of 1831, I commenced by calculating the number of new parishes, with a population of 2000 each, which would be requisite in existing parishes containing more than 4000 people; and the addi-

tional number which would be produced by dividing into *two*, such existing parishes as range between 2500 and 4000 population. It would be of course impossible here to enter into details. The result was, that about 2600 new parishes, with a population of 4,800,000, were requisite in 1831. I further calculated, that in parishes with less than 2500 people in each, about 360,000 souls were unprovided with clerical aid. The population of England and Wales has increased by about two millions since 1831, one half of which we may add to the previous estimate of spiritual destitution. The whole result will then be as follows :

DESTITUTE POPULATION, 1831.

In parishes exceeding 2500 population	. 4,800,000
In parishes with less than 2500 population	. 360,000
Total	. 5,160,000
Increase since 1831	 1,000,000
Destitute population, 1841	 6,160,000

It seems probable, then, on the whole, that about Total of
Destitution.
SIX MILLIONS of the inhabitants of England and Wales (including the great body of the town and manufacturing population) are beyond any effective control and guidance of the Established Church with her present means; and that not less than 6000 additional clergy are requisite at this moment to place her in a state of *full efficiency*. It may be alleged, however, that Dissent numbers many ad-

herents in our more populous districts, and therefore that some deduction ought to be made from the number of clergy requisite to impart religious instruction. Without admitting the principles on which this objection is based, it is impossible to deny that it is likely to have much weight. We will, therefore, make an allowance for the existence of dissent, and reduce our claim to 3,000 additional clergy for the instruction of our destitute population. I believe that this would be too great a reduction, and that dissent does not number anything like 3,000,000 adherents in the districts of which I am speaking. Perhaps, indeed, its entire force does not amount to that number. We will, however, assume the most moderate basis possible; but it must be taken into account, that the population of England and Wales is increasing at about the rate of two millions in every ten years; and, moderately speaking, this would require a correspondent increase of one thousand clergy; so that, on the whole, the present number of additional clergy required being 3000, the whole number in 1851 would be 4000, and in 1861, 5000.

In considering the means for supplying this deficiency, it may be remarked, that even were funds provided for their support, the clergy themselves cannot be multiplied *ad libitum*. It could only be by the slow and gradual process of education, that

any great addition could be made to the numbers of the clergy. The effect of creating at once a large number of new benefices, well endowed, would be simply to drain the clergy from the poorer parts of the country. It is clear, then, that it would not be necessary or expedient to provide *immediately* any large funds for payment of additional clergy.

A second observation is, that a large proportion of the additional clergy would of course be *curates*. I believe that 1000 new incumbents would suffice, and that the remaining 4000 clergy might be curates and deacons with very moderate salaries. This would of course materially diminish the expense of any such augmentation in the number of clergy.

With reference to the 1000 new incumbencies, I conceive that we may look to their endowment by the Church herself, if additional facilities are afforded for the redistribution of ecclesiastical property.

Endowment of new Benefices.

(1.) The Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill embodies a most judicious provision, empowering patrons to apply a portion of the revenues of richly-endowed benefices, in their gift, to the augmentation of smaller livings also in their patronage. This will doubtless lead to the endowment of many new benefices, for private liberality will furnish small incomes, which will be augmented in the mode above referred to.

(2.) It seems to me that the principle of this measure might be safely and advantageously carried still further. There are hundreds of benefices, the incomes of which are amply sufficient to support their incumbents, while the population is so small, that it scarcely affords them sufficient employment. It is common to find benefices worth from 400*l.* to 1000*l.* per annum, with populations of 100, 200, or 300 souls. In such cases it might perhaps be advisable to empower the Bishop of the diocese, with consent of the patrons, to unite a parish to some other adjoining parish, on the next vacancy; to assign the revenue of the parish thus united to a *new* parish in some neighbouring town or populous district (the patronage to be vested in the patron of the benefice united as above); and to pay from the collections, hereafter to be mentioned, an income to the incumbent of the two parishes united, in consideration of his undertaking the care of both, or providing a curate, as the case might be. In this way we might, I think, obtain good endowments for many new parishes at a very small expense, as the remuneration above mentioned need in no case exceed 75*l.* per annum, and might in many cases be still less.

(3.) There are several hundreds of parishes with large populations as well as large incomes. Such parishes might be divided, with consent of their patrons, where they are *private* property. In other

cases the Bishop might, perhaps, be empowered to divide them on the next vacancy, even without the consent of the patrons.

With a view to encourage patrons to permit such divisions, and to act on the power of apportioning and transferring the incomes of benefices, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners might grant small augmentations to the new benefices thus founded, which would also be provided with curates and clerical residences by the plans which will be hereafter detailed.

It seems to me probable, that by the adoption of these measures under some modification, means might be provided for the gradual endowment of 1000 new benefices or upwards.

We are now to examine the remaining part of the subject—the provision for 4000 curates and deacons. We will suppose that 2000 of each would be sufficient, and that the incomes of the former may be placed at 100*l.* per annum each, and the latter at 75*l.* per annum. The total amount requisite for their salaries would then be 350,000*l.* per annum.

To meet this charge, it seems to me, that there are two measures within the power of the Church, which would probably be found sufficient for all that could be wanted.

(1.) The first is that which has been recom-

Sunday
Collections.

mended by Mr. Gresley, as it has also been by Archdeacon Wilberforce, and many other clergymen—the adoption or revival of the practice of Sunday Collections during the time of Divine Service. The Sunday offertory is, in fact, prescribed in the rubric of our own prayer-book. It certainly prevailed in the primitive church, and was generally adopted for many ages. In Ireland it is universally the custom to make collections of alms in Church immediately before the Sermon every Sunday; and this collection, which is always distributed amongst the poor, is, in some places, so considerable, that I have been credibly informed that 3*l.* or 4*l.* per Sunday, or even more, is collected in certain churches.

The simple fact of the universal existence of this practice in so poor a country as Ireland, would seem to demonstrate the possibility of introducing a similar measure into England, with a view to obtaining funds for Church Extension. Considering the great amount of wealth in this country, and, I must add, the charitable and liberal disposition of a large portion of our congregations, I cannot think there would be any difficulty in introducing the practice, with so holy and religious an object in view. Where the contribution was voluntary, and was urged and recommended on religious motives, it would surely be difficult to imagine on what grounds Christian congregations

could object to it. It may be said, that the amount would be insignificant, and that many persons would not contribute to this fund. It is possible that some little time might be requisite to instruct our congregations in their duties in reference to the subject, but it is one which is so deeply connected with religious considerations, that if the clergy were obliged to bring it continually before the consciences of their hearers, it is morally impossible that there could be any failure.

In fact, several clergy in various parts of the country have, without the least difficulty, restored the practice of Sunday collections in church. One clergyman mentioned to me lately, that the collections in his church, (which are applied to the erection of a new church,) average more than 4*l*. each Sunday.

If there has been no difficulty in establishing the practice in these cases, its general adoption would be still more certain, and its productiveness more secured, by the authority of an Act of Parliament, aided by Royal Letters, Pastoral Letters from the Archbishops and Bishops, (occasionally repeated,) and by the sermons and exhortations of the whole clergy.

With a view to estimate the probable amount of the fund which might be derivable from this source, I have endeavoured in vain to find a Return, which appears to have been made to the House of Com-

mons in May 1830 or 1831, being an Account of the collections made for the poor in the churches of Ireland from 1825 to 1829. This Return has not been printed in the Parliamentary Papers, and after a long search, (in which I have to acknowledge the kind assistance of Sir Robert Inglis,) it seems that the paper in question probably perished in the conflagration of the Houses of Parliament.

I have, however, made inquiries in various quarters relative to the amount of these collections, and on the whole it seems probable, that about five shillings per Sunday is the average collection in each church.

If we suppose every church in England and Wales contributing at the same rate as is customary in Ireland, we should obtain an income of 156,000*l.* per annum; for the churches in this country do not fall short of 12,000. If we suppose the average to be 7*s.* 6*d.* per Sunday, which might be fairly expected from the greater wealth of this country, we should have an income of 234,000*l.*; and if the average were ten shillings per Sunday, which would not be impossible, we should have 312,000*l.* per annum.

Parish
Clerks.

(2.) The second measure which I have to propose for consideration, refers to the funds at present possessed by parish clerks. The important part assigned to those officials in divine service, and the

manner in which it is too often performed, have frequently excited wishes for the abolition of the office. This would not be possible in all cases, but I apprehend that in very many parishes it would be practicable to replace parish-clerks by well-educated deacons. The incomes of clerks are sometimes, in town-parishes, not much less than those of the incumbents. We have lately seen an appointment to one of these offices in London, the value of which is estimated at 600*l.* or 700*l.* per annum. I would suggest, that the Bishop of the diocese be authorized at the next vacancy in the clerk's office in any parish where the income of that office shall exceed 30*l.* or 40*l.* per annum, to suppress the office of parish clerk, and to licence a deacon, who shall discharge the duties now imposed on the clerk, and receive the emoluments customarily payable to him. I would also propose, that the deacon's salary should be in all cases made up to 75*l.* per annum from the Sunday Collection fund.

Supposing that there are 2000 parishes in England, which on an average furnish clerks' salaries of 40*l.* per annum, we should thus have an income of 80,000*l.* per annum towards the payments of deacons. It is possible that there would not be so large a number of parishes capable of affording this income, but many parishes would do much more: *e. g.* the income of the parish clerk in

Marylebone, of which I have spoken, would give many deacons incomes of 40*l.* each.

Total In-
come to be
expected.

On the whole, then, we have shown, that *at least* 156,000*l.* might be expected from Sunday collections, and 80,000*l.* from the incomes of parish clerks, making a total of 236,000*l.* per annum. But besides this, it should be borne in mind, that as new churches were built, the Sunday collections would increase. If we suppose 1500 new churches to be built in ten years, the Sunday collections at the end of that time would be 175,500*l.* per annum. A thousand additional churches in the following ten years would raise the income to 188,500*l.* making a total (with the incomes of parish clerks) of 268,500*l.* per annum. This would leave a deficiency of little more than 80,000*l.* pe annum; which might perhaps be provided from the resources of the country, if necessary; but I am persuaded that the liberality of our congregations would much exceed the above estimate, and that there would be no deficit whatever. An average contribution of 7*s.* 6*d.* each Sunday, instead of five shillings, would render the Church wholly independent of parliamentary grants. I have not, in the foregoing calculation, taken into account the incomes payable to the incumbents of united parishes, but the amount would not be considerable.

It has been already remarked, that no very rapid

increase could be effected in the number of clergy. At present the number of clergy ordained annually in England is between 400 and 500, as far as I can calculate. It would be extremely difficult to obtain an addition of 250 to this number, and yet that addition must be obtained annually, if we wish to meet the deficiencies of the Church in twenty years. Supposing it possible to obtain such an addition, we will proceed to estimate the expense. According to the foregoing plan, fifty of these clergy might be new Incumbents, without charge to any fund. A hundred might be Curates, with total salaries of 10,000*l.* per annum; and a hundred might be Deacons, with (on an average) 35*l.* per annum in addition to the emoluments from the offices of parish clerks. The whole charge then would be in the first year, 13,500*l.*, and we have an income of 156,000*l.* In this way it is plain that for many years there would be a large *surplus* after paying the incomes of additional clergy, and I would propose that this surplus be handed over to the Incorporated Society for Building Churches.

II. CHURCHES AND GLEBE-HOUSES.

I now come to the subject of additional Churches and Residences for the Clergy, and the funds requisite for their erection.

As we have been calculating on supplying the wants of a population of five millions in twenty years, we will suppose that 2500 additional churches might be sufficient, each adapted to the wants of a parish of 2000 souls. These 2500 churches would cost about 10,000,000*l.*, and an equal number of clerical residences might probably cost three or four millions in addition. Large as this sum may appear, there would not, I conceive, be any impossibility in obtaining it without pressing much on the public resources.

(1.) It is not easy to estimate the amount which has been annually expended of late by private liberality in the erection of churches: I am persuaded that it has not fallen short of 200,000*l.* There can be little doubt that the same liberality will be continued, and if necessary increased. We have thus perhaps 4,000,000*l.* towards the sum required.

(2.) The surplus of the Sunday collections above mentioned might, on the whole, amount to from 1,000,000*l.* to 1,800,000*l.*, or even more.

(3.) In addition to this, very large sums might be derived from a rearrangement of ecclesiastical property, in the possession of bishops and chapters. Various modes might be suggested by which the property in question might be made more productive, and by which ecclesiastical landlords might be relieved from the inconveniences attendant on a fluctuating income. The whole subject is, however, of so much delicacy, and requires such mature consideration that I shall content myself with this passing allusion. The interests of the Church of Ireland have been grievously injured, and ecclesiastical tenants have received very unfair advantages by the *construction* which has been given to the Irish Church Temporalities Act, in reference to the valuation of perpetuities, in evident contradiction to the intentions of those by whom that Act was framed ; but we need not, I trust, expect similar injustice in any other case. There can be no doubt that by an improved system of managing ecclesiastical property, very large sums might be obtained without any infringement of the rights of property generally, or any diminution of the revenues enjoyed by the Church. The *improved value* which would be given to this property by an alteration in its *tenure*, will sufficiently show the reasonableness of these expectations. I am persuaded that from this source, combined with those which have

been already adverted to, we might derive funds nearly adequate to the demand for additional churches and glebe-houses.

On the whole, then, it seems probable, that funds to a great extent might be obtained for additional clergy and churches without any parliamentary grants. The amount may possibly have been too highly estimated, but there seems to be little reason to doubt, that, for many years at least, there would be no necessity to apply for grants of public money.

III. BISHOPS.

WE are now to consider a branch of the subject, the importance of which cannot well be over-rated ; I mean an increase in the number of our episcopal sees. That there has long been a general wish in the Church for additional Bishops, is unquestionable. The apparent or real difficulties, however, which have surrounded the subject, especially since the measures for redistributing the dioceses, have induced a sort of despondent feeling on the subject. I cannot but think that the present is a favourable moment for reconsidering the question. The position of the Church is now widely different from what it was in 1833 or 1834, when continual

efforts were made to remove the Bishops from the House of Lords.

The theory of our constitution recognizes the propriety of additional episcopal superintendence: for an act of Henry VIII. still remains unrepealed, which would authorize the Bishops and the Crown in adding about thirty suffragan Bishops to our present number. That power has indeed not been acted on since the time of James I., because it was found that the suffragans thus constituted were not sufficiently under the control of their diocesans; and the whole arrangement was one which seemed difficult, if not impossible, to be reconciled with the general rules of the primitive Church; still the *theory* of our constitution warrants us in saying that an increase in the present number of sees is expedient and necessary.

Proposed
Increase
Constitutional.

This is confirmed by the fact, that while the population of England and Wales at the passing of that act did not perhaps exceed two or three millions, it now probably amounts to sixteen millions.

If we compare the duties of the English and Irish Bishops, we shall find the latter, after the reduction in the number of sees by the act in 1833, superintending on an average about one hundred incumbents each; while the English dioceses contain on an average 412 parishes each. If a Reformed parliament judged one hundred parishes sufficient to employ an Irish Bishop, why should England be so much worse

provided for? If we were placed on a footing with the Church in Ireland, we should have 107 sees.

Small num-
ber of our
Sees.

England possesses in proportion to her population a smaller number of Bishops than most of the European states. We have only twenty-six Bishops for a population of sixteen millions. France, even after her revolutions, has three times the number of our sees, with twice the amount of population. Before the revolution her episcopal sees were 145, and her population about twenty-eight or thirty millions; Spain, with ten or twelve millions, has sixty Bishops; Greece, with less than one million, has thirty-six Bishops; Portugal, for three or four millions has fourteen Bishops; Italy, Sicily, and the adjoining islands have twenty-four millions and 263 Bishops, according to the *Notizie* published at Rome in 1837. Romish Ireland has thirty Bishops for about six millions. Ancient Asia Minor, and Northern Africa, which were perhaps twice or three times as large as England and Wales, contained respectively 400 and 500 sees. Ancient Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, which probably never contained a population in any degree approaching to ours, contained 108 episcopal sees.

Looking to the invariable rule of the ancient Church, to place a Bishop in every great city, for the purpose of giving energy, unity, and consistency to the large body of clergy collected there, it seems strange indeed to think that places like Liver-

pool, Birmingham, Leeds, Manchester, Nottingham, Sheffield, Derby, Newcastle, Bath, Plymouth, and many other towns of great population and importance, should have been so long left without resident Bishops. Romanism has, with its usual quicksight-^{Romanism.} edness, availed itself of our deficiencies, and fixed the residence of its pretended Bishops in large cities, where none of our Bishops are stationed. Birmingham, Bath, Wolverhampton, Liverpool, and other important stations, are thus circumstanced; and in some of these places Romish ecclesiastics are gradually assuming a position, which can only arise from the want of Bishops in those localities.

It is not for me to say what number of episcopal^{Episcopal duties.} sees would be sufficient for England and Wales. There can be no impropriety, however, in mentioning some principles which may lead to a solution of the question. A diocese ought to be of such dimensions, that a Bishop might, without much difficulty, visit *personally*, every year, or at least every second year, all the parishes subject to his jurisdiction, with a view to examine *on the spot* all the particulars which concern the spiritual well-being of the people; to preach the Gospel; and to administer confirmation without those large assemblages which are productive of many inconveniences. The vast size of our dioceses has long rendered this efficient system of superintendence wholly impossible, and in consequence discipline has become re-

laxed, and the unity of the Church has been impaired. Enquiries instituted at a distance, and in writing, can never have that cogency which would attend on personal inspection. All bodies which are exempt from a complete and searching local inspection, are liable to fall into disorders.

This system, however, which was practised universally for many ages in the Church, which is still prescribed by all the old canons, and which was revived in the Roman Catholic Church by the Council of Trent, could only be established amongst us by adding *largely* to the present number of sees. Six or twelve additional Bishops would scarcely make any perceptible difference in the duties at present devolving on the Bishops.

Objection
answered.

I contend for the necessity of *episcopal* inspection. Archdeacons and rural deans are valuable assistants to a Bishop, but they are only assistants; they are not invested with episcopal authority—they are not the chief pastors of the clergy and people whom they may visit officially: they are of *human* institution, and cannot become substitutes for Bishops. If the multiplication of archdeacons and rural deans is to supersede the necessity for additional Bishops, and if, in fine, the episcopal office is merely one of general superintendence, and its spiritual duties consist only in ordination and confirmation, it might be argued that the dioceses of Lincoln or Norwich, with five or six archdeacons each, ought to be the

standard for all England; and, therefore, that the number of sees might be *reduced* to eight or ten.

It may seem paradoxical to say that a large increase in the episcopal body would in some respects involve less difficulty than a small increase—yet this appears to be the case. If six or eight additional Bishops were appointed, it would certainly be invidious to place them in a position in any degree inferior to that of their brethren, and yet it would be probably impossible to make such an addition to the episcopal bench in the House of Lords.

Question
of Seats in
Parliament.

On the other hand, suppose so large a number of new sees founded by the division of the present dioceses, that one or more might be placed under the jurisdiction of every existing see—the latter by this arrangement becoming metropolitan or archiepiscopal, and exercising over its suffragans the same jurisdiction which the see of Canterbury exercises over the dioceses subject to it; in this case the total impossibility of introducing so large a body of prelates into the House of Lords, and the distinction in ecclesiastical rank, would furnish obvious reasons for not investing the new prelates with the peerage, except beyond the walls of parliament. The Church would be sufficiently represented by her twenty-four metropolitans, and her two archbishops, who, in virtue of the rank given to their suffragan sees (which would still remain subject to their au-

thority) would *become* patriarchs, whether that title was assumed or not.

Incomes.

The same distinction in ecclesiastical and temporal rank would point out the propriety of giving the new Bishops smaller incomes than the metropolitans, as their expenses would be less. Perhaps 2000*l.* per annum on an average, with a See House, might be sufficient. In particular cases it might be advisable to give more ample endowments. These incomes might, (I speak with some confidence after an examination of the resources of the Church,) be provided in the following way:—

Endow-
ment for
new Sees.

(1.) Some of the wealthier parochial benefices in the gift of the crown, might, on their next vacancy, be made to furnish endowments for new sees, by contributing a portion of their incomes to that object, after moderate endowments had been reserved for the incumbents.

(2.) The Crown might also become possessed of other rich parochial benefices by exchange of advowsons, and the same plan might be resorted to with them. I have before me a list of about sixty benefices in the gift of the crown, bishops, and chapters, from which an income of nearly 100,000*l.* might thus be derived.

(3.) The Crown is in possession of the tithes of (I think) forty-five parishes, which might perhaps

be employed, in several instances, in the endowment of bishoprics.

(4.) The deaneries of St. Paul's and Westminster would furnish incomes and residences for two suffragans of the metropolitan see of London.

(5.) It is worthy of consideration whether, with such an object in view, the incomes of the majority of the existing sees might not, on the next vacancies, be fixed at rather a lower scale than at present, *e. g.* 4000*l.* instead of 5000*l.* per annum, and the surplus applied to found new sees.

See houses might be provided by allowing the See Houses. incomes of the new sees to accumulate for three years before any appointments were made.

Patronage might be obtained for them, by assign- Patronage. ing to them the benefices which have lately been taken from the Deans and Chapters; and possibly, considering the great diminution which would take place in the extent of the present dioceses, and the consequent lessening in the numbers of the clergy subject to them, some portion of the present episcopal patronage might be allotted to the new sees.

The Crown would reasonably claim the appointment to all the new sees, having supplied their endowments, and would thus gain a full equivalent for the sacrifice of some of its present advowsons. The sees would only be founded gradually, as the

resources became available, and it would probably be twenty or thirty years before the whole scheme could be carried into full effect.

When it is remembered that before the foundation of the existing parishes, the *tithes* and offerings of every diocese were paid to the Bishop directly, and were employed in his support, as well as in that of the priests and deacons ; and that, even at present, many sees are endowed with tithes ; it seems that no objection in point of *principle* can be advanced against the plan of endowing sees from tithes ; and when it is further considered, that by the adoption of this plan, the rich endowments of various parochial benefices, which at present seem in some degree disproportionate to their population, would be applied to the moderate support of offices of undeniable utility and of much labour, there can be little doubt that the public would recognize at once the purity of the motives which had suggested this design.

With a view to prevent the evils which might result from inequalities in episcopal incomes, it would, I conceive, be absolutely essential to provide, that no suffragan should be translated to a metropolitan see, except on the petition of the primates and the majority of the metropolitans, grounded on the merits and fitness of the person proposed. Some check of this kind would be ab-

solutely essential to the honour and independence of the Church.

Were this design carried into effect, the future ecclesiastical distribution of England and Wales might possibly be somewhat in the following mode:—

PATRIARCHATE OF CANTERBURY.

(ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, PATRIARCH.)

<i>Metropolitan Sees.</i>	<i>Suffragan Sees.</i>
Canterbury	Dover, Maidstone.
London	Westminster, Southwark, East London, Middlesex.
Winchester	Guildford, Portsmouth, Christ Church.
Rochester	Colchester, Chelmsford, St. Alban's.
Chichester	Lewes.
Salisbury	Malmsbury, Warminster, Dorchester, Sher- borne.
Exeter	Barnstaple, Plymouth, Tavistock, Bodmin, Falmouth.
Wells	Bath, Taunton, Ilchester.
Gloucester	Bristol, Tewksbury.
Worcester	Birmingham, Coventry, Evesham.
Hereford	Ludlow.
Lichfield	Wolverhampton, Newcastle, Derby, Ches- terfield.
Oxford	Reading, Farringdon, Aylesbury.
Peterborough	Northampton, Leicester.
Ely	Huntingdon, Bedford, Bury.
Norwich	Ipswich, Dunwich, Yarmouth, Walsingham.
Lincoln	Louth, Stamford, Gainsborough, Notting- ham, Southwell.

*Metropolitan Sees.**Suffragan Sees.*

St. Asaph	Bangor, Montgomery.
St. David's	Brecon, Carmarthen, Cardigan.
Llandaff	Monmouth.

PATRIARCHATE OF YORK.

(ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, PATRIARCH.)

*Metropolitan Sees.**Suffragan Sees.*

York	Sheffield, Beverley, Whitby, Northallerton, Sodor and Man.
Durham	Newcastle and Hexham, Berwick and Lindisfarn.
Carlisle	Kendal.
Chester	Macclesfield, Shrewsbury.
Ripon	Leeds, Halifax, Huddersfield.
Manchester	Liverpool, Rochdale, Preston, Lancaster.

It may be objected, that the erection of two Patriarchal and so many Metropolitan sees in so small a country as England, would be inconsistent with the general practice of the Church; but I would point to the Patriarchs of Lisbon, of Venice, of Aquileia, and of the Indies, each of whom has, I believe, a much smaller number of bishops under his jurisdiction than the English Patriarchs would have. The Patriarch of Moscow has about 30 bishops subject to him. The Greek Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, have not so many; nor have those of the Maronites, the Nestorians, or the Monophysites. Let it be remembered, too, that the Archbishop of Canterbury ex-

ercises jurisdiction not only in England, but in America, the West Indies, India, Australia,—a more extensive jurisdiction than any of the ancient Patriarchs ever possessed. In *this* case, at least, there could not be any objection to the title of Patriarch.

It may be further objected, that Metropolitans ought to have more than one or two suffragans. In reply, I would point to the Metropolitan of Calcutta with *two* suffragans; and I would also remark, that in the Russian and the Greek Church, Metropolitans or Archbishops are to be found without *any* suffragans. There is no impropriety in giving this *honorary* title to bishops immediately subject to Patriarchal sees, even although they may not be invested with Metropolitan jurisdiction. So that, in point of strict ecclesiastical propriety, it would not be *necessary* to place a suffragan under every existing see. For example, the see of Rochester might become Metropolitan without suffragans, and the new sees in the whole of the ancient diocese of London might be subject to its Metropolitan; and I would here add, that the general principle and practice of the Church seem to require, that the see of this great metropolis should be raised to the same rank which has been conferred on the see of the second city in the empire.

With reference to the *size* of the dioceses, according to the foregoing plan, it may be observed,

that each would contain, on an average, 170 clergy, and 200,000 people.

IV. ECCLESIASTICAL SEMINARIES.

THE necessity of Ecclesiastical Seminaries, or of some mode of providing for the education of additional clergy, is closely connected with the question of Church Extension. At present, I believe, about 450 deacons are ordained every year. How are we to raise the number to 600 or 700? The salaries offered under any plan of Church Extension can afford no encouragement to the wealthier classes to devote their children to the ministry; nor does it seem that the Universities can much enlarge the number of their students, or reduce the scale of expense so low, as to bring university education generally within the reach of persons of small fortune.

Were it possible to devise some additional system of education for holy orders at *half* the expense now incurred in the universities, (that is, at 60*l.* or 80*l.* per annum,) many parents would gladly avail themselves of the opportunity; and thus, while the universities would still continue to educate the mass of the clergy, and all the wealthier classes, Ecclesiastical Seminaries might enlist in the service of religion, talents and ener-

gies which must otherwise have been devoted to secular pursuits; and might have the INCALCULABLY IMPORTANT effect of connecting the *middling* classes of society more closely with the Established Church.

It has been frequently urged of late, that the Cathedral Clergy are the most appropriate superintendents of clerical and religious education. This generally-admitted principle points at once to the provision for Ecclesiastical Seminaries. Eight or ten institutions of this kind might easily be attached to as many Cathedrals, and placed under the direction of their Deans and Canons. Education might here be imparted *free of expense*, while the houses of the suppressed canonries would afford lodgings for numerous students; and the mode of living might be easily regulated so as to ensure economy. The students might remain in these Seminaries for seven or eight years before their admission to holy orders, and receive a thoroughly good professional education. With a view to secure uniformity of instruction, it might perhaps be provided that no class-books should be employed, except those permitted by the heads of the Church, and no professors appointed without the same sanction; and an effective power of control and visitation should be lodged in the proper hands.

The revival of two or three canonries with small incomes in each of the Cathedrals, under the powers

reserved by the Church Temporalities Act, would probably be found to furnish ample inducement to fellows of colleges in the universities, or others, to give their services for the education of youth in the Theological Seminaries, especially if it should seem likely to lead to the exercise of episcopal patronage in their favour.

Objections, perhaps insurmountable, may be entertained to this particular plan of providing for an increased supply of clergy. I am only anxious to urge on the friends of the Church the necessity for adopting *some* measure. If nothing be done, we shall probably, before long, find extreme difficulties with reference to the supply of clergy.

I would only add, that if the above plan seems liable to any material objections, they might perhaps be obviated by connecting the proposed institutions with the universities, *e. g.* by making them introductory to a certain theological course at either university, where a theological hall or college might be founded for the reception of students from the different seminaries.

Having now completed what was proposed at the commencement of this paper, I have only to add a few observations on the mode in which the above plans might be carried into effect.

(1.) The Sunday Collections might either be under

the direction of each bishop in his own diocese, with the assistance of some clergy and laymen; or be thrown into a general fund, and managed by all the bishops, aided by some commissioners in London. Either plan has its advantages and disadvantages, but the discussion would take up so much space that I cannot here enter upon it.

(2.) The institution of deacons' offices, and the division and erection of parishes, would naturally belong to each bishop.

(3.) The surplus of the Sunday Collections might be paid to the Incorporated Society for Building Churches, and the Society might receive increased powers for assigning parochial districts, if necessary.

(4.) The re-arrangement of ecclesiastical property with a view to increase its value, might perhaps be most properly conducted by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, who might appoint a Committee for this purpose, or receive, if necessary, some augmentation of their numbers.

(5.) The number of new sees requisite might be determined by a Special Commission, with powers to examine fully into the present and prospective condition of the Church, and into all other circumstances calculated to guide them to a right decision. Their report of the number of dioceses necessary, and of the arrangements proposed, might lead to the grant of the necessary powers to the Eccle-

siastical Commissioners, to endow the new dioceses by the processes above mentioned. And the existing sees might be made liable to the new arrangements on the next vacancy, or with consent of their bishops.

(6.) It would seem advisable that the Prelates should every year make a return to Parliament of the wants of their dioceses in respect of clergy and churches; of the number of new parishes founded under this plan, and of additional Curates and Deacons paid from the Sunday collections. If the measure were found to be inadequate, there would then be definite grounds for calling on the State for additional funds.

THE END.

